



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

I	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
08/22/2003	Gust H. Bardy	020.0339.US.CON	8423
10/21/2004		EXAM	INER
Law Offices of Patrick J.S. Inoye		EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT	
		ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER
0.4			
	10/21/2004 Patrick J.S. Inoye	10/21/2004 Patrick J.S. Inoye	10/21/2004 EXAM Patrick J.S. Inoye EVANISKO, GEO ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		SW
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/646,105	BARDY, GUST
	Examiner	Art Unit
	George R Evanisko	3762
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a repl bly within the statutory minimum of thirty (in will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this communication. JDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 A	<u> August 2003</u> .	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ Thi	s action is non-final.	•
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	·	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☑ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	cepted or b) objected to by e drawing(s) be held in abeyance ction is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apporting documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	_	
1) M Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Motice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Sur Paper No(s)/l	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date
 Notice of Bransperson's Faterit Brawing Review (F10-940) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date multiple. 	_	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Page 2

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The claimed subject matter which is not discussed in the specification is the determination of the "absence" of CHF.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 25, 26, 32, 48, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3, 14, 25, 32, and 48, both occurrences of "at least one of" are vague since only one or the other is used. It is suggested to delete "at least".

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3762

Claims 1-81 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-81 of U.S. Patent No. 6336903. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims are narrower and meet the limitations of the broader application claims. In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the patented claims a server and/or database to perform the processing and store the data since it was known in the art that server systems are used to provide processing of data since they can perform large calculations quickly and are able to easily send data to other systems and since it was known in the art that databases store data to provide a central point for the collection and storage of data.

Claims 1-81 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-11, and 13-21 of copending Application No. 10/042402. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application claims are narrower and meet the limitations of the broader application claims. In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the copending application claims a server and/or database to perform the processing and store the data since it was known in the art that server systems are used to provide processing of data since they can perform large calculations quickly and are able to easily send data to other systems and since it was known in the art that databases store data to provide a central point for the collection and storage of data.

Art Unit: 3762

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The subject matter of the independent claims could either not be found or was not suggested in the prior art. The subject matter not found was the apparatus or method for diagnosing and monitoring CHF by determining a patient status change by comparing one recorded measure from one monitoring set to another related recorded measure and testing the patient status change for one of an absence, an onset, a progression, a regression, and a status quo of CHF against a predetermined indicator threshold corresponding to a quantifiable physiological measure of a pathophysiology indicative of CHF, in combination with the other elements/steps in the claims.

The closest prior art of Riff shows the use of recording and comparing data for edema, which is an indicator of CHF, but not for CHF.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R Evanisko whose telephone number is 703 308-2612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703 308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,105 Page 5

Art Unit: 3762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

George R Evanisko Primary Examiner Art Unit 3762

GRE October 17, 2004